STOKES.

Another Day's Tedious Search After a Jury.

A Preparatory Tilt Between Counsel.

THE SEVENTH JUROR OBTAINED.

PROCEEDINGS YESTERDAY.

The trial of Edward S. Stokes was resumed yesterday morning, before Judge Ingraham, in the Court of Oyer and Terminer. The court room was not so crowded as it was in the former days of the trial, the uninteresting nature of the proceedings doubtless deterring the lovers of sensation. A half a dozen ladies occupied seats within the enclosure allotted to the members of the bar. The prisoner was brought into court accompanied as usual by the his aged father, whose deep interest in everything that goes forward still continues.

Mr. McKeon again objected to private counsel being engaged for the prosecution, and requested His Honor to note an exception, the request being refused.

District Attorney Garvin consenting, the exception was noted.

SWEARING OF JURORS RESUMED.

John D. Hamlin was the first man called, and in answer to Mr. McKeon said he had heard of the case, had formed and expressed an opinion and had that opinion still. To the District Attorney he said that he had derived this opinion from reading. He had no idea that his opinion would influence his verdict. He had no bias for or against the prisoner, and would make up his mind on the evidence. Challenge not sustained and challenged to the favor.

He had no connection with either side. Was no relative of Mr. Hamlin, of Buffalo. He had not had any connection in business with the Erie Railway.

The triers found the challenge not true, but the defence challenged peremptorily.

Leopold Reiss had formed an opinion, and thought he would be a prejudiced juror; he had so often expressed himself on the matter that he doubted his ability to act impartially. Excused.

Jacob Ullman, basket dealer, read the Coroner's inquest, and had formed and expressed opinions. His opinion was on his mind still. He would try if he went on the jury to act impartially, but doubted that he could.

Electus Ramsdell thought he had formed and expressed an opinion. He hardly thought it would influence his judgment after hearing the evidence on both sides. Still he was in a little doubt about it. Excused.

Robert Buttle had a positive opinion, and was excused.

Edward H. Beyen thought his opinions would in a measure affect his verdict. He was excused.

This exhausted the second panel.

The third panel was then put into the ballot box.

SUGGESTION FROM THE COURT.

The Court suggested that questions should be put in as short a way as possible. The new law had, he remarked, made very little practical change in the law, except to give each side thirty challenges.

JURORS FINED.

The jurors who had not answered to their names were each fined $100.

Edward Cohn, of Fifty-second street, had partially formed an opinion, but if evidence were brought before him he would perhaps change it. He was excused.

James McGovern had formed an opinion. He thought he could sit on the jury, and after hearing the evidence on both sides, give his verdict on that alone impartially. But he thought it would require some evidence to remove the opinion he had. Challenge sustained.

Clarence H. Livingston had formed an opinion of a decided character, and was excused.

Adolph A. Frankfield had not formed or expressed any opinion, and was challenged to the favor.

I read the details of the occurrence the day after it occurred; I don't think I conversed freely with my neighbors about it; I spoke a little about it to those coming in; the reading left some impression on my mind, and I think it would require some evidence to remove that impression before I should be perfectly unbiased.

The triers found the challenge true.

John S. Ferguson had an opinion, and could not sit impartially. Excused.

Alexander F. Sloter and Leonard F. Requa were excused.

Theodore H. Clark happened to be close by at the time of the killing, and

SAW COLONEL FISK AFTER HE WAS SHOT,

so that he had a very decided opinion. Excused.

Julius Schutz had formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the accused, based on the merits of the case, as he understood it; would not convict or acquit on his impressions, but it would require evidence to remove his impressions; candidly, he did not think he could sit without bias, as he was a man naturally inclined to violent prejudices.

Theodore Mule, John B. Gardiner, Charles Franklin Clark, Peter Johnston and Harsen H. Smith, clerk in in the general office of the Erie Railway office, were all excused.

Peter Feeny had a fixed opinion and was excused.

Moses G. Rosenblatt, No. 35 Mercer street, had an opinion, and was excused.

Benjamin Franklin Atwood, patent medicines, No. 307 West Fifteenth street, did not know that he had formed, though he might have expressed, an opinion. He thought he had some opinion, and it would take evidence to remove it. Excused.

Russell G. Reynolds, Walter R. Darrow and Benjamin F. Coyte all had opinions.

FIFTH JUROR OBTAINED.

Byron Stone, No. 23 Great Jones street, bookkeeper, had an opinion which he would try and forget if he were to go on the jury. It would take evidence to remove his opinion; but he would condemn or acquit only on the evidence.

The challenge was not sustained.

He was challenged to the favor, and was found competent by the triers. Both sides accepted him, and he was sworn as a juror in the case, and took his seat with the other four.

Mr. Stone is quite a young man, apparently not more than twenty-five years of age. He appears most intelligent and answered all the questions put to him in a straightforward, concise manner that showed he would be a good juror. He looked steadily at Stokes while he was being sworn. The latter's manner when he was ordered to stand up was quite a contrast to his bold, excited appearance at early stages of the trial. He stood with

HIS HANDS QUIETLY CROSSED

and looked once at the juror who confronted him, after which he meekly cast his eyes down and remained in this position until the solemn form of oath was read by Mr. Sparks, the Clerk of the Court, in his deep, sonorous voice. When the juror was sworn he quietly resumed his seat and his eyes followed Mr. Stone inquiringly to his seat in the jury box, as if he would divine everything that was

PASSING IN HIS MIND.

Mr. Stone is unmarried.

Edward Hasbrook was told to stand aside, as he had formed an opinion which it would require a good deal of evidence to remove.

Lazarus Adler was told to stand aside by the Court also.

ANOTHER TILT BETWEEN COUNSEL.

Jacob August said he had an opinion which it would require strong evidence to remove.

The District Attorney was about to cross-examine the witness, when Mr. McKeon said:—

"Does the District Attorney insist on examining this man, who says that he has formed an opinion which it would require strong evidence to remove? If so the responsibility is on him (striking the table vehemently); I have never seen a prosecuting officer do so.

District Attorney Garvin—I remember the Cancemi case, in which the learned gentleman acted as private counsel for the prosecution. Was he doing then what he calls

HOUNDING A MAN TO DEATH?

Mr. McKeon—That is not true, sir.

Here Judge Ingraham rapped his gavel two or three times on the bench.

Mr. McKeon—The District Attorney has no right to make such an assertion without proof; I never received

BLOOD MONEY.

Judge Ingraham (rapping again)—This is departing from the rule which I laid down with regard to personalities in this case.

Mr. McKeon (sitting down)—I am ready for the personalities.

Judge Ingraham to the District Attorney—Go on, sir.

The District Attorney then renewed his cross-examination and Judge Ingraham sustained the principal challenge. The juror was told to stand aside.

THE SIXTH JUROR OBTAINED.

Theodore Flemme said he had formed no impression. He was challenged to favor. He used to read the papers, but seldom read about murders; murders made no impression on him. The challenge to favor was found not true by the triers, and the juror was accepted.

He is a tall, old man, a native of Germany. He speaks but broken English, but swears that he could understand it well enough to try the case. When he took his seat in the jury box Stokes regarded him attentively for a few moments, as when the other juror was sworn. A rather curious fact in connection with this gentleman was that he some years ago married

THE SISTER OF LOUIS KOSSUTH,

the Hungarian exile. Mr. Flemme is a commission merchant.

John Branigue, a very old man, was next put on the stand. He had formed an impression which it would require a good deal of evidence to remove. He was examined at length by the District Attorney, and in reply to a question as to whether he had any feeling for or against the deceased or the prisoner said that he did not like that class of men generally.

Counsel for the prisoner—What do you mean by that class of men?

This was objected to by the District Attorney, but the objection was overruled and Mr. Branigue was told to answer.

Pursing up his mouth and leaning forward he delivered the following speech, with great unction:—

"I don't like stock operators or

'FANCY MEN'

or men of any kind who don't earn an honest livelihood." (Great laughter, in which the Court could not refrain from joining. Stokes laughing as heartily as anybody else.) He was told to stand aside.

Benjamin Lewis had a fixed opinion. Judge Ingraham asked him a few questions in a low tone, and Mr. McKeon, rising, said, "Your Honor, I did not hear that last question." "I told him," said the Judge with a smile, "that he might go."

Mathew V. Cable, Peter Van Geisor, Nathaniel S. Butler and Stephen H. Mason were excused. Solomon Abrahams was excused because he did not speak or understand English well.

Samuel Adler and Daniel Green Handy had decided opinions and were excused. A recess for half an hour was then ordered.

After the Recess.

On the reassembling of the Court the calling of the panel was proceeded with.

David Rosenbaum sworn—Was a jeweller at 178 Division street; had partly read the accounts of the shooting of Colonel Fisk; had not quite formed an opinion; had felt sorry for the event; the same impression still remained on his mind that he had at first; did not know whether he understood English well enough to know all that might be said to him as a juror; understood all that was said to him in ordinary conversation; it would require evidence for him to decide the case, but not to change any opinion he had now; had no bias for or against the prisoner.

The challenge as to favor being denied by the triers, the defence challenged the juror peremptorily.

George Bowlend sworn—Had an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the accused, but thought he could render an impartial verdict; his previous opinion would not influence his conduct as a juror; would not acquit or convict any man upon a previous opinion; had not the slightest bias for or against the prisoner; was not acquainted with Fisk or Gould or W. M. Tweed; had been a Custom House officer within the past two years; had not been approached by any person in regard to being a juror; was in the Custom House seventeen months, but left there a year ago; was formerly in the commission business.

The challenge as to favor was sustained by the triers.

William Williams sworn—Had formed an opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the accused. Challenge sustained by the Court.

Jacob W. Itgander sworn—Was not in the city at the time of the shooting of Fisk; only returned last Sunday; had not read much about the case, and had not formed an opinion; did not know Fisk or Gould or the Morse family; had no bias for or against the prisoner.

Challenged peremptorily by the prosecution.

James Adair sworn—Had formed an opinion about the case, such as it would require evidence to remove. Challenge sustained by the Court.

Herman Greenbaum sworn—Had formed an opinion about the case, such as it would require a great deal of evidence to remove. Challenge sustained by the Court.

THE SEVENTH JUROR.

John E. F. Bond sworn—Was a clerk in the Mutual Life Insurance Company at 261 Broadway; had formed an opinion about the case, but it amounted only to a recollection of the facts as he had read them; would be governed entirely by the evidence if he were a juror; was not opposed to capital punishment; had no bias one way or the other.

The challenges being denied, this juror was accepted by both sides and was sworn in in usual form.

Solomon Ernest sworn—Had formed an opinion which would influence his verdict. Challenge sustained.

George Henry Bartholomew sworn—Had formed an opinion which would require considerable evidence to remove. Challenge sustained.

Anthony T. Gallagher sworn—Had formed an opinion about the killing of Fisk, but not as to the man that did the killing; thought he could render an impartial verdict; was a neighbor of and pretty intimate with W. M. Tweed, but had not talked with him about this case; had known him for twenty or thirty years; they were both democrats; was not reappointed school teacher by Mr. Tweed's influence.

Challenged peremptorily by the defence.

John McGowan sworn—Had formed a strong opinion about the case. Challenge sustained.

James D. Trimble sworn—Had formed an opinion, but he would throw it aside if he were a juror; he would simply be governed by the evidence; at present had a bias. Challenge sustained.

Herman Ahrenstorf sworn—Had formed a fixed opinion. Challenge sustained.

Judah Swift sworn—Had formed a fixed opinion. Challenge sustained.

Gustavus Rosenthal, sworn—Had formed a strong opinion. Challenge sustained.

Maximilian Wiale sworn—Had formed an opinion which it would require considerable evidence to remove. Challenge sustained.

William Redwood Wright sworn—Had an opinion. Challenge sustained.

Henry Chase Aigar, sworn—Had an opinion, but not such as would prevent his giving an impartial verdict on the evidence; had not the slightest impression as to the guilt or innocence of the accused. Challenge as to favor sustained by the triers.

Moritz Herzberg sworn—Had a fixed opinion. Challenge sustained.

This concluded the second panel of 100, and a further panel of 100 was ordered for this morning by His Honor.

The Court then administered the usual caution to the jury in regard to allowing none to converse with them about the trial.

Mr. McKeon said he hoped His Honor would also charge the jury not to read anything about the trial in the newspapers.

The Court charged as requested, and recommended the jury to skip over the reports of the case.

The Court then adjourned until this morning at half-past ten o'clock.

RUM AND MURDER.

The Proprietor of a Coffee House Shot Dead by a Drunken Brawler—Arrest of the Murderer.

BATON ROUGE, La., June 21, 1872.

Great excitement exists in the city in consequence of the murder of Charles Betz, proprietor of the Star Coffee House, last night. A party of men were carousing in that establishment to a late hour, when Betz, wishing to close, put them out of the house somewhat rudely. Among those ejected was T. J. Lloyd, a resident of Tennessee, temporarily residing in this city. Lloyd, who had been drinking freely, went to his boarding-house, and returning, met Betz on the banquette in front of his saloon. A few angry words passed between them, when Lloyd drew his pistol and fired five shots in rapid succession. One of these

PENETRATED THE HEART OF BETZ,

who fell and died almost immediately. The murderer was promptly arrested by the police and conveyed to prison, where he now is. Lloyd is far gone with the consumption and he is now lying in a dangerous condition. It is proper to state that neither party is here connected in any way with the political convention now holding its session in this city. Betz was an old resident of Baton Rouge, a German by birth, and has always been esteemed as an honest, industrious and peaceable citizen.

DIAMOND CUT DIAMOND.

A Merchant Has Another Merchant Arrested Who Had Him Arrested on an Alleged False Charge—A Peculiar Case.

A merchant named Edward Lumley was arrested on Thursday at his residence in West Forty-seventh street by Deputy Sheriff Curry, in pursuance of an order of arrest granted by Judge Larremore, of the Court of Common Pleas. The complainant in the case is Lucas Thompson, an importer, who resides at 161 West Forty-sixth street. The affidavits upon which the order of arrest was founded state that Mr. Thompson has large business connections in this country and Europe, and that on the 5th of January last Lumley and his brother had him arrested on a charge of corrupt perjury, and that on the strength of the charge he was imprisoned, and only released after several hours' confinement by giving $5,000 bail. Mr. Thompson's affidavit sets forth that on an examination being held he was adjudged not guilty, and that owing to his arrest having been published in the newspapers he has suffered in reputation to the extent of $50,000. He therefore lays his damages at that figure. Mr. Lumley was committed to Ludlow Street Jail in default of $5,000 bail.

FATAL BLOW FROM A HATCHET.

The Prisoner Censured and Held to Bail.

Coroner Keenan yesterday held an inquest on the body of James Burke, a child five years and six months old, whose parents live at 314 East Thirty-second street, he having died on Sunday last in Bellevue Hospital. On the 3d inst. a number of youngsters, seeing a wheelbarrow standing on the pavement in East Thirty-second street, seized hold of and rolled it away fifty or sixty feet. George Rose, a youth at work there, pursued the boys, and tossed a hatchet he held in his hand at them, probably more to frighten than with the intention of injuring any of the children. Unfortunately the hatchet took effect on the head of deceased and fractured his skull. George instantly took the child to a drug store, from which he was removed to Hospital, where death ensued as stated.

In their verdict the jury censured Rose for throwing the hatchet, and Coroner Keenan decided to hold him to bail in the sum of $2,500 to await the action of the Grand Jury.

GORDON GORDON.

The Case Resumed Before Judge Brady, of the Supreme Court—Jay Gould's "Dogs of War"—Gordon Not To Be Arrested and How It Came About.

Punctually at twelve M. yesterday Gordon Gordon put in an appearance before Judge Brady, of the Supreme Court, his recent unpleasant experiences through failure of prompt compliance with the orders of the Court having probably taught him a lesson in this regard. In addition to Mr. Strahan and another counsel, ex-Judge Porter was on hand to assist in wielding the legal cudgels in his behalf. For Jay Gould there appeared the same counsel as heretofore, Messrs. David Dudley Field, Henry S. Knox and Elihu Root. Judson Jarvis, Deputy Sheriff, hovered about the court room, keeping an official eye upon Gordon. The court room was thronged, many of course having been attracted from curiosity to see the pseudo lord, but the most being the overflow of those unable to obtain entrance to the Stokes trial, there being no bluecoated barriers here, as at the latter Court, to free admission.

ABOUT GORDON'S ARREST.

Mr. Strahan stated that before the examination of Mr. Gordon was resumed he would like to make a motion to vacate an order of arrest granted by Judge Barrett against Mr. Gordon on the 11th of June.

Mr. Root said that this motion was predicated upon voluminous papers which had only just been served on him.

Mr. Field hoped that the examination might go on at once and this matter be attended to afterwards.

Senior counsel for Gordon insisted that the ægis of the Court was thrown around Gordon while he was a witness, but that Jay Gould had

DOGS OF WAR

ready to let loose upon him the moment he was through his testimony. He wished that the Court would protect Mr. Gordon against the projected purpose of his arrest and disgrace.

Mr. Field asked that Mr. Root be allowed time to read the papers, and meantime that the examination might be resumed.

Senior counsel for Gordon said that it would take but ten minutes to read the papers.

Judge Brady said he would attend to nothing else until this motion was disposed of, and gave the time for this purpose.

Mr. Root and Mr. Knox then set assiduously to work reading over the papers in question. Mr. Field entered upon the collation of authorities applicable to the case. Mr. Gordon's counsel busily chatted with their client, who seemed to be in the best of spirits, unmindful of the Damoclean sword that might or might not be suspended over his head, and Judge Brady, who had been holding Court two hours, seized the opportunity to vacate the bench and catch a few moments' respite.

On Judge Brady's return Mr. Field read the law on the subject from the Code in a decision in the United States Circuit Court.

Mr. Porter invoked the common law. All that was asked was an order to stay proceedings until a motion could be made to vacate the order of arrest granted by Judge Barrett. This, he insisted, came clearly within the jurisdiction of the Court.

Mr. Field insisted that granting such stay was equivalent to vacating the order of arrest. In this case Gordon was charged with having in his possession about

HALF A MILLION DOLLARS

of another man's money without security. When Gordon was free from this Court he would hurry off to Canada. He asked for a delay for the purpose of answering the affidavits.

Judge Brady asked if there was any new matter in the affidavits.

Mr. Field—There is.

Mr. Strahan—The only new matter is that the stocks are in my possession, given by Jay Gould to Mr. Gordon.

Mr. Field asked for delay on other grounds. On Thursday they telegraphed to London, Paris and Hamburg to persons mentioned by Mr. Gordon in connection with alleged business transactions with them. Gordon had stated that Dr. Harscher, of Hamburg, induced him to come to this country. They had received an answer from Hamburg that no such person lived there or ever had lived there. He asked a postponement of the motion till four P. M., when probably answers would be received from the other telegrams.

Senior counsel for Gordon entered upon a lengthy review of all the circumstances connected with the cross suits between Gordon and Gould. He insisted the execution of the order of arrest be tied up until the whole matter could be investigated upon the merits. Gordon, he alleged, held these securities under a written contract of Gould.

Judge Brady replied that the statements of counsel affected the merits of the case. He would give Mr. Gould's counsel time to examine the new matters. He would propose that the securities be given to the custody of the Clerk of the Court, and that would end the matter.

Mr. Field—We will consent to the vacation of the order of arrest if this is done.

Mr. Strahan—They shall be handed to the clerk—a portion of them to-day and the rest by ten o'clock to-morrow morning.

Judge Brady—Having brought this branch of the case to an agreeable ending, I will announce another agreeable feature—a recess for twenty minutes. (Laughter.)

Mr. Porter said, on the reassembling of Court, that the intention on their side, in pursuance of the suggestion of the Court, is to leave the securities in the hands of the Court. During the interview the opposing counsel had drawn an order leaving Mr. Gordon subject to Mr. Field's order. He would not consent to any such order being made.

Mr. Field claimed that the understanding was that the securities should be deposited as stated, but that until such securities were adjusted they could not waive the right to the prisoner's arrest. Further than this there were $20,000 damages, the result of sales of stocks in Philadelphia at a loss.

Mr. Strahan said that the action was for the payment of specific stocks mentioned in the complaint. As to the matter in Philadelphia, no action had been commenced against brokers there, and this transaction should not be mixed up with the present case.

Mr. Field insisted that the securities in Mr. Strahan's possession be deposited with the Clerk forthwith.

This subject was discussed at length, and ended by Judge Brady directing another order to be drawn, and meantime Mr. Gordon was again called to the stand.

EXAMINATION OF GORDON RESUMED.

Q. What time did Mr. Gould give you the package of securities? A. It was during the morning I sent the letter produced to Mr. Gould. (The letter has been already published, and expresses Mr. Gordon's acceptance of securities sent him by Gould, and his willingness to co-operate with the latter in regard to matters connected with the Erie Railway.)

Q. The letter begins, "The stock, &c."—what does the "&c." refer to? A. I think the "&c." is an addition of Jay Gould.

Q. You say you have been to great labor and expense. Were you at expense, and what? A. I was at considerable expense.

Q. You say you expended a million dollars. Was that so? The question was objected to, as no such specification was contained in the complaint. It was excluded.

Q. You say, further, that you will find a powerful army of supporters willing to work for you and not live on you. Was that so? (Objected to and excluded.)

Q. How soon after this did Mr. Gould come again? A. Between three and four o'clock in the afternoon; he remained into the evening.

Q. Did you not swear that Mr. Gould came at two o'clock in the afternoon?

Counsel for Gordon insisted that Mr. Field had no right to examine the witness as though he was not worthy of belief.

Judge Brady said he would not allow the examination to be thus conducted.

Q. What took place at this second interview? A. Mr. Gould took the securities he had previously given me and gave me puts and calls; I gave him the note then.

Q. Have you not sworn that when Mr. Gould returned at two o'clock you handed him the note? Objected to and excluded.

GORDON'S NOTES TO GOULD.

The examination for some time from this point referred to Mr. Gordon's notes to Gould, which have already been published. The witness was called upon to explain the circumstances under which they were written. No new facts of material interest were elicited, though there were some spicy interchanges between counsel, which the Court was at length compelled to check.

MONEY RECEIVED FROM GOULD.

Q. You received $160,000 in greenbacks from Mr. Gould? A. I received $180,000.

Q. You asked for $200,000, saying that you had made a mistake; what was the mistake? A. An error in addition.

SECURITIES RECEIVED FROM GOULD.

Next in order the examination covered the list of stocks and securities received by Gordon and Gould, which has already been published in the HERALD, and need not be recapitulated.

Q. What occurred at your third interview with Mr. Gould? A. I don't remember anything in particular; we talked on Erie Railway matters generally.

Q. When did you discover your mistake as to Mr. Sears not being in your room when Mr. Gould gave you the puts and calls? A. After my last examination.

Q. Do you remember stating that Mr. Gould had hardly finished writing out the puts and calls when Mr. Sears came into the room? Was that a mistake? A. It was; Mr. Gould was writing another memorandum when Mr. Sears came in; I made a mistake as to the date.

ARTICLE IN THE NEW YORK HERALD.

Mr. Gordon said that it was an error stating that he called Mr. Gould's attention to an article in the NEW YORK HERALD on himself at the Metropolitan Hotel. This occurred at the Erie building, Mr. Sears was present. He read himself the article out loud, and his reply to it. He told Mr. Gould, "You see what I get by being in your company." At this stage the senior counsel of Mr. Gordon objected to the crowd pressing so close about himself and his associates. He believed they were spies and eavesdroppers and wished that they be ordered to keep at a further distance. The crowd fell back on the suggestion without waiting for the interference of the Court.

HIS LORDSHIP.

Q. Mr. Gould speaks of you as your lordship in one of his letters; had you a right to be called a lord? (Objected to and sustained.)

Q. This letter has a coronet on the top; is that an earl's or duke's coronet. A. An earl's coronet.

Q. Had you a right to this coronet. A. It is a coronet I have always used. It has a monogram under it; if an earl's coronet it would have a crest under it.

Q. The question is have you a right to use it? A. I have; it is the crest I have always used and which belongs to my family.

The subject of family crests was discussed at length. The Judge said he used a crest which he made up for himself, and he thought any one had a right to do so. He thought that this matter had been settled by a concession in open Court by Mr. Gordon that he was not a lord, a Scottish peer, the Earl of Aberdeen or a member of the British Parliament.

WORD FROM PHILADELPHIA.

In this connection Mr. Corlies, District Attorney of Philadelphia, told what witnesses they were prepared to call in that city to show that Mr. Gordon had represented himself as entitled to the titles above named. The Judge said that he had nothing to do with other legal proceedings elsewhere.

MORE ON THE TITLE QUESTION.

Q. Did not Mr. Gould address you as Lord Gordon? A. Not ever that I remember.

Q. Did not Mr. Sears address you as Lord Gordon? A. Not in conversation.

Q. Did he not address you in telegrams as "right honorable?" A. Yes, sir.

Q. Had you a right to such title? (Objected to and excluded.)

Senior Counsel for Gordon—Mr. Gordon, are you pumped out—are you dry? (Laughter.)

Here again the examination switched off to Gordon's letters to Jay Gould, written about the time of the Erie *coup d'état*, which, like the previous letters have been published, and consumed considerable time.

THE COMBINATION WITH GOULD.

Q. Did you co-operate with Mr. Gould, as stated in one of your letters? A. I did.

Q. With whom? A. Mr. Horace F. Clark, Mr. Lewis Roberts and others.

Q. Who are the others? A. Mr. Seligman, the banker.

Q. Were there any others? A. I believe three; I got those three.

Q. What was the combination? Tell the whole programme. A. The combination was to carry sufficient stock to elect a new board; Jay Gould was to resign and put the property in the hands of the stockholders.

Q. Was Mr. Gould to be continued as President? A. If the stockholders elected him; we had stock enough with what Mr. Gould had to carry the election; Mr. Gould was to carry out his part of the contract.

Q. What was his part of the contract? A. To resign the Presidency; to place his resignation in my hands; to place the line in the possession of the stockholders; to stop aggressive legislation; to discontinue bribery and corruption; to let the bill stop which he was to pass through your (Mr. Field's) assistance. (Laughter.)

ON ERIE RAILWAY SUITS.

Q. What were the aggressive litigations and suits into which he said he had been drawn by your connivance? (Laughter.)

Mr. Field declared the response impertinent, and asked that it be stricken out.

Mr. Porter insisted that the only impertinence was on the part of counsel.

Mr. Field said the statement was false. The Court ordered the latter part to be stricken out.

Q. Did Mr. Gould name the title of any aggressive suit? A. I do not remember the title of any he mentioned.

Q. Do you know whether any of those suits have been stopped? (Objected to and excluded.)

THE SICKLES MOVEMENT.

Q. Did you make any effort to stop the Sickles movement culminating on the 11th of March? A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you not say that you knew of this movement months before, and came here to co-operate with Sickles? A. No, sir.

Q. Did you not tell Mr. Gould that you was the agent of Heath, Raphael & Co., the English stockholders? A. I never mentioned their names to him.

Q. Did you say anything about the English stock? (Objected to and excluded.)

Q. In the combination spoken of was any board of directors agreed upon? A. No particular names were mentioned.

Q. Have you stated all the programme? A. To the best of my belief I have.

Q. Did you not swear on the 17th of May that a part of the Board of Directors had been agreed upon? (Objected to and overruled.)

CONTROL OF THE PRESS.

Q. What was the control of the press referred to in one of your letters? (Objected to and excluded.)

Q. Did you have any control of the press? (Objected to and excluded.)

Q. After the robbery mentioned in your complaint have you not frequently visited Mr. Belden's family? A. I think I have been there twice.

Q. How old were you when you came to this country? (Objected to and excluded.)

Q. When did you come here? A. In 1867.

Q. Did you come here by advice of Dr. Hirschberg, of Hamburg? (Objected to and excluded.)

Q. You say you owned enough of Erie stock with Mr. Gould to carry the election; the stock of the road was $83,000,000; it would require $42,000,000 to carry the election; now, where was the rest of this stock to come from? A. From the gentlemen in combination with me; I could have made up $20,000,000; some I would have got from my family.

Q. Mention their names. A. My brother-in-law, Baron Thurl, and his wife.

Q. Give the Baron's residence. A. I object to this; it causes me great annoyance, and my family; he wished to protect them.

Judge Brady said that all he could do was to caution the members of the press not to mention their names.

Witness stated that the conveyance was through telegrams and dictations.

The Judge told him that he must answer the question.

Witness answered that the last he heard from them they were in Berne, Switzerland.

Q. Have they any permanent residence? A. I cannot tell.

Q. Are any other members of your family owners of Erie stock? A. No others.

Mr. Field here ended his examination of the witness.

Mr. Strahan entered upon his cross-examination.

Q. Why did you not prefer a complaint against Belden? A. I believed he was my friend; I had given him only a short time before $10,000 to relieve him from bankruptcy; he was the tool of Jay Gould.

After a few other questions Mr. Field put some additional interrogations, when the examination, at a few minutes to six o'clock, was declared closed.

It was subsequently arranged that the argument of the other motions be heard on the second Tuesday of September. Meantime, upon Gordon's compliance with the agreement mentioned in the fore part of the above report as to depositing the securities with the Clerk of the Court, the order of arrest against him will be vacated.

HAGERTY'S HAUL.

The New Court House Janitor Betakes Himself to New Quarters with His Furniture.

Hagerty, the janitor of the new Court House, and who was made so notorious by the robbery of the vouchers in the Comptroller's Office some time since, yesterday left the building and succeeded in getting away with his furniture. It will be remembered that efforts had formerly been made to prevent him from taking any of the furniture away, certain authorities claiming that the furniture in his apartments belonged to the city. The removal was begun about seven o'clock yesterday morning. The police on discovering the truck at the door and the owner loading it with the furniture sent word to Captain Leary, who hurried over to the City Hall and thence made a pounce upon the trunks in Hagerty's rooms. Hoping to find some trace of the stolen vouchers he made a thorough search, but found no clue. He then called upon the Court House Commissioners, two of whom proceeded with him to Hagerty's quarters, and Haggerty at once exhibited bills of sale for the furniture, showing that he had bought the goods himself. Captain Leary next called upon Comptroller Green, but the latter said he had no authority to stop the removal of the furniture. The "removal" then went on undisturbed.

ABANDONED WAIFS.

The remains of a female infant were yesterday found in the vault attached to premises No. 88 Thompson street. The body was sent to the Morgue and Coroner Keenan notified. Of course the child was without parents, and no one knew by whose agency the body was thrown into the vault.

John Benson, a boy living at 115 Suffolk street, yesterday found the body of a female child in the dock foot of Christopher street, North River, and it was taken to the Ninth ward station house, from which the remains were sent to the Morgue to await an investigation before Coroner Keenan.

THE RAILROAD SMASH-UP AT METUCHEN, N. J.

Neither of the persons injured by the recent smash-up on the New Jersey Railroad at Metuchen are likely to die. The case of one lady is peculiarly distressing. Her name is Alma Patassien. She and her husband, who is said to be the son of a Danish naval officer, and to whom she had been married but two months, were *en route* to San Francisco. Yesterday she was taken to St. Barnabas Hospital, in Newark, for treatment, she having suffered amputation of the right arm. The unfortunate husband, who is a fine-looking fellow, seems to feel the dreadful blow with even greater poignancy than his wife, who bears up with marvellous courage. Another Dane, J. N. Frazer, lost his right leg. His condition is not considered safe.

A NEW ORLEANS SENSATION.

Attempted Assassination in a Private Household—A Divorced Wife and her Revenge—The Parties Well Known in New York.

[From the New Orleans Times, June 18.]

Between half-past 11 and 12 o'clock yesterday morning, while Mrs. A. M. Holbrook was engaged at her toilette in the second floor front room of her residence, No. 208 Constance street, between Orange and Richard, she became conscious that some one had entered her apartment, and, turning to observe the visitor, was instantly fired upon by a well dressed woman standing in the door.

Horror stricken at the evident attempt at assassination, Mrs. Holbrook faced her assailant, and after the discharge of a second shot, succeeded in clutching the weapon. The two women struggled in a death-like contest for some seconds, and the pistol at length dropped upon the floor. At this juncture the would-be murderess seized a quart bottle of bay rum, which was standing on the bureau, and began beating Mrs. Holbrook with it over the head. It was quickly shivered into a hundred pieces, and the infuriated woman, snatching a China vase from the mantel piece, continued the attack.

The report of the pistol attracted the attention of an aged colored cook, who gave the alarm, and a white servant, named Mary, rushed to the rescue. She seized the assailant (who proved to be Jennie Bronson, the divorced wife of Mr. Holbrook,) from behind, and the present Mrs. Holbrook, succeeding in extricating herself, rushed out of the house.

The unfortunate lady, covered with blood, first went in next door to the residence of Mr. Rainey, where a servant furnished her with a basin of water and a change of clothing, and the family being absent, she then took refuge at the residence of Mrs. Martin, just opposite. The attack created the wildest excitement, the servants left in a body, and, in probably less than five minutes, Jennie Bronson held undisputed possession.

THE WORK OF DEMOLITION.

Flushed with triumph, the woman at once commenced a wholesale attack on the furniture. Mirrors, pictures and armoire glasses were shivered into atoms, and whatever articles of jewelry that could be found on the second floor were scattered about in the wildest confusion. Descending to the ground floor she procured an axe from the kitchen and resumed the work of destruction. A china closet, containing apparently two barrels full of dishes and cut glass ware was completely stripped of its contents, and the promiscuous heap was beaten into fragments upon the hall floor. A sideboard, containing castors, silver service and wine glasses, shared the same fate. The glazed doors of several bookcases were knocked into smithereens, and the dial plate of a handsome clock broken to fragments, the sounding board of a new piano smashed to pieces, and a portrait of Mr. Holbrook hurled from its place on the wall and cut to shreds.

An hour later, when our reporter reached the scene, he found the drawing room, parlor, dining room and hall heaped with the *debris*, and indeed, had the establishment been jarred by the explosion of nitro-glycerine, or shaken by a first class earthquake, the demolition could not have been more complete.

THE EXCITEMENT.

A curious crowd of ladies, children and servants still lingered in front of the house; but even at that time information concerning this most unfortunate *contretemps* was difficult to glean.

A lady, living in the immediate vicinity, and fearing, from the shots, that a murder was being perpetrated, sent her servants in all directions for the police. At least twenty minutes elapsed before an officer could be procured; but at length a little boy succeeded in finding Officer Dorsey, of the Sixth precinct, who at once came to the house.

MEDICAL AID.

In the meantime Dr. Thomas Nicholson, residing on Magazine street, near the scene, had been sent for, and he reached the house first. The doctor found Jenny Bronson in the parlor. She had ceased her work at that time, and was endeavoring to staunch the blood from a slight wound on her finger. The doctor extracted a piece of broken glass from the cut, and hearing that Mrs. Holbrook was across the street, immediately repaired to that domicil. The only remark Jennie Bronson made was "D—n her, I want to kill her."

Mrs. Holbrook, whom the doctor found to be quite faint from loss of blood, presented a most deplorable picture. The unhappy lady had received a deep gash in front of the forehead, where the hair joins in one an inch long on the left of the head, and a similar wound on the right of the head. The top is also badly bruised. Her hair was completely matted with blood, and at the first her garments fairly streamed with gore. He found no difficulty in checking the flow of blood, and believes that, although Mrs. Holbrook will suffer great pain for several days, she is not in any great danger.

THE PISTOL

is a small Smith & Wesson seven-shooter. The chamber was taken off very shortly after the weapon fell, when it was found that four cartridges were missing.

THE ARREST.

Officer Dorsey, upon reaching the house, at once took Jennie Bronson into custody, but at her solicitation procured a cab, and drove with her to Pacanier station. There she was conducted to a room adjoining the clerk's office, and placed in charge of the colored turnkey. Officer Dorsey, at her request, went to the hotel, procured from her room a travelling dress and skirt, and brought the garments to the station. She appeared much excited, but declined an interview with any one. Mr. Holbrook reached the station perhaps half an hour after the arrest, and preferred a charge of shooting and wounding Mrs. Holbrook with intent to kill.

THE ACCUSED.

At a second visit paid to the station house our reporter was admitted to the presence of the accused. She declined making any statement of the affair, saying she only desired justice. She did state, however, that, coming to her own house, she had found it in the possession of another woman, and had conducted herself accordingly. This assertion was made with many tears.

At four o'clock Captain Boyd Robinson informed Jennie Bronson that he would be forced to place her in a cell. She strenuously objected, but at length was induced to enter cell No. 2, where chairs and a stretcher were placed for her accommodation.

She reached the city from New York yesterday morning, and at once secured a room at Wade's Upper City Hotel, at the corner of Magazine and Jackson streets. In a conversation with a well-known gentleman on board the train on Sunday, she is said to have remarked, in a wild way, "I do not expect to be alive twenty-four hours from this time."

PREVIOUS HISTORY OF THE CASE.

The handsome, and by no means uncultivated cause of the above terrible misfortune, was met by Mr. Holborok during the war, and being of a social disposition, and apparently ready to receive the attentions of gentlemen, his advances were encouraged. They travelled together, became intimate, and at length Jennie Bronson went North. Mr. Holbrook met her again at the New York Hotel during a summer tour, and the intimacy was resumed. She then represented herself as a widow, and the daughter of an eminent attorney. When Mr. Holbrook was about leaving New York she sent for him to her room and demanded that he should marry her. Upon his refusing, Jennie swallowed an immense dose of laudanum, and, lying down, calmly informed him that she had but two hours to live. A physician was sent for, but she refused utterly to permit a stomach pump to be applied, and so worked upon the feelings of a naturally credulous gentleman, that he at length consented. A priest, found conveniently near, was summoned, the ceremony was performed, a stomach pump was applied and the woman recovered. That day Mr. Holbrook, after making liberal appropriations for her support, left for New Orleans, it being agreed that she should remain in New York. He had not been long in the city when Mrs. Holbrook, selling her furniture, came South. She stopped at Havana, and finally, greatly to Mr. Holbrook's surprise, reached here, and, taking rooms at the St. Charles, summoned him to her presence. A series of violent quarrels, in which he was maltreated in the grossest manner, was very shortly afterward the result of their meeting, and Mr. Holbrook was compelled to seek a private lodging. She ferreted him out, entered his apartment, cut up his clothes, and, in fact, acted so maliciously that proceedings for a divorce were instituted. A reconciliation followed; and, in another quarrel, she went to his house, on Hevia street, and broke the mirrors and furniture, and, when the man in charge of it attempted to eject her, she bit him so severely that to this day he bears the mark of her teeth.

There was another reconciliation, and then another quarrel in the editorial room of the *Picayune*, in which Mr. Holbrook was severely bitten. Proceedings for divorce were again instituted, but when the cause came to trial the litigants were off on a bridal tour and it was dismissed. So the matter went on for years, and finally, in consideration of certain emoluments, she left forever.

They met again at the North, where Mrs. Holbrook, conspicuous as the best dressed woman of the resort, again attracted her husband, and both returning to the city went to housekeeping. They lived peaceably together for some time, but the trouble again breaking out a few months ago, suit for divorce was instituted in the Eighth District Court. Upon being served with the process, she wrote a contemptuous reply to the plaintiff's attorney (Messrs. Mott and Semmes), which was filed, and then went North. Judgment was rendered in Mr. Holbook's favor, and about a month ago he married.

Jennie Bronson is the daughter of an oysterman doing business near Harlem, New York. While separated from Mr. Holbrook she amused herself by writing squibs for the newspapers, and, we believe, at one time succeeded in entering the Hotel Dieu as a Sister of Charity. She is a handsome, stormy woman, with jaws like a tigress, a fine figure, and at times most attractive.

The present Mrs. Holbrook is not only an estimable lady, but one of Southland's sweetest poets, and under the *nomme de plume* Pearl Rivers is known the length and breadth of the land. A large circle of sincere friends truly sympathize with her in this trying hour, and will watch with no feigned anxiety for her convalescence.

The body of an unknown man, about thirty-five years of age, five feet eight inches in height, and in a perfectly nude state, was yesterday found floating in the water off Fort Washington Point, North River, and sent to the Morgue. Coroner Young will hold an inquest over the remains.

THE COURTS.

Interesting Proceedings in the New York and Brooklyn Courts.

Passing Counterfeit Money—The Water Meter Mandamus—The Jurisdiction of the Courts and the Spanish Consul—Judgment on an Action for Careless Driving—Business in the General Sessions—Decisions.

UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER'S COURT.

Attempting to Pass Counterfeit Money in Joke.

Before Commissioner Shields.

George H. Crowell, who claims to have bought the right to what is known as the "Brazell" system of detecting counterfeit money, was arrested by Officer Charles Beck, of the Twentieth precinct, and brought before Commissioner Shields yesterday, on a charge of attempting to pass a counterfeit $20 note upon "Johnny" Dwyer, keeper of a restaurant at 400 Eighth avenue.

Albert J. Adams, an eye-witness of the transaction, says that Crowell came into Dwyer's place, called for a glass of ale, and offered the $20 note in payment; that Dwyer discovered the character of the note, and had Crowell arrested.

Crowell explained the transaction to the Commissioners by saying that he had been drinking freely, and only offered the bill "for a joke," to see whether Dwyer would discover its worthlessness.

He also produced certificates from bank officers to whom he had imparted his secret for the detection of counterfeit money.

The evidence of the police, however, proved that he had in his possession a counterfeit fifty cent and a counterfeit twenty-five cent bill, although he denied having any other counterfeit money. Committed for examination.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS.

Cost of Water Meters.

Before Judge Barrett.

In re Joseph F. Navarro vs. George M. Van Nort.—Application was made for a mandamus against Mr. Van Nort, Commissioner of Public Works, to compel him to draw from the Comptroller and pay $283,600 for water meters furnished at $70 each, under a contract made with Mr. William M. Tweed, as Commissioner. It is stated that these meters have been delivered from time to time, and that they are now stored in the corporation yard. The act under which Mr. Tweed made the contract was a special act to improve the water supply of the city, to lay new mains and supply new meters. The defence is that the clause authorizing the Commissioner of Public Works to make the contract is contained in the tax levy, a local act, and is not contained in its title; and further, that the special act referred to contains three things in the title, and is therefore unconstitutional; and still further, that though this act appeared to give discretion to the Commissioner, it was intended that it should be exercised under the forms prescribed by the charter, while in fact no bids were advertised for, the contract was not drawn or approved by the Corporation Counsel, and there was no security for proper performance. The above points were submitted by Mr. Dean on behalf of the city. The reply on behalf of the relator will be made on next Tuesday.

Decisions.

By Judge Barrett.

The People, &c., Mathew Corrigan, vs. The Young Men's Father Mathew United Abstinence Benevolent Society.—Motion denied.

Mills vs. Quigley et al.—Motion to vacate judgment and execution denied, with $10 costs; motion for attachment granted.

William Percy vs. George Thornton et al.—Motion denied, with $10 costs.

Ann Lowney vs. Michael Lowney.—See memorandum.

Wise et al. vs. Morris et al.—Motion denied, with $10 costs.

In the Matter of the Petition of Carl Ochler, &c.—Writ dismissed.

The People, ex rel. Brady, vs. Department of Public Instruction, New York.—Motion denied, with $10 costs.

Pedro Montells vs. Maria Montells.—Report confirmed and judgment of divorce granted.

Foley, &c., vs. Benton et al.—Satisfaction must be vacated and set aside.

In the Matter of the Petition of Margaret McIntosh for Appointment of a Trustee, &c.—Report of referee confirmed and order affirmed.

MARINE COURT—CHAMBERS.

Important Decision as to Spanish Vessels—Jurisdiction of Spanish Consuls.

Before Judge Gross.

Pedro Francis vs. The Owners of the Spanish brig Liaral.—This action was brought to recover amount claimed for wages on account of services rendered as seaman on board the Spanish brig Liaral on the voyage from Barcelona to New York. Counsel for the Spanish Consul moved to show cause why the attachment issued should not be vacated and discharged and the proceedings of the plaintiff dismissed. The Court, after hearing argument for and against the motion, in rendering his decision, said this action was against the defendants as non-residents of the city and county of New York, and although the warrant of attachment recited that fact, yet the affidavits on behalf of plaintiff failed to state it, the Court holding that the affidavits should have stated the fact of such non-residence to give the Court jurisdiction. He dismissed the case on the ground, among others, that under and in accordance with the stipulations of the treaties now existing between the governments of the United States and Spain, this Court has no jurisdiction in differences between the captains, officers and crews of Spanish vessels with reference to the adjustment of wages and the execution of contracts. For plaintiff, A. Nash; for defendant, William L. Raymond.

MARINE COURT—PART I.

A Warning to Careless Drivers.

Before Judge Tracy.

German vs. Schwaezfacher.—The plaintiff on New Year's Eve last started from her home to do some marketing, and while quietly crossing avenue C was driven over by the defendant, who came driving his horse and wagon down the avenue at a furious pace. The lady was quite seriously bruised, besides having one of her ribs broken. The Court rendered a judgment against the defendant for $250, stating that it was partially imposed by way of a fine, and as a warning to reckless drivers on the public streets.

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS.

Before City Judge Bedford.

Sentenced for Manslaughter.

At the opening of the Court yesterday Nicholas Gallagher, who was indicted for murder, in causing the death of William Buran, on the 27th of April, by firing a stone at him, and who on the 11th inst. pleaded guilty to manslaughter in the fourth degree, was arraigned for sentence.

Assistant District Attorney Stewart said that the complainant and the prisoner had a difficulty in a lager beer saloon in Delancey street, and when they got into the street Gallagher picked up a stone and threw it at him. He was struck back of the ear and the skull was fractured, which caused his death. He (Mr. Stewart) believed that in accepting the plea all the leniency which the accused deserved was extended to him.

Judge Bedford said he fully concurred in the remarks of the District Attorney, and that when he took the plea of manslaughter in the fourth degree he had given him as much leniency as he could as the representative of the people. The sentence was imprisonment in the State Prison for one year.

Grand and Petty Larcenies.

James McMahan, who on the 24th of April stole a gold watch worth $150 from David J. Connell, pleaded guilty to an attempt at grand larceny and was sent to the Penitentiary for one year.

Peter McGee was indicted for stealing from the pocket of Harvey E. Nevins a check, dated New York, June 8, 1872, drawn on the Ninth National Bank by Mackenzie, Newman & Co., to the order of Kennedy, Hutchinson & Co., for the sum of $4,446. Nevins was walking through Nassau street, and upon feeling some person pushing against him he turned round and saw McGee with his hand on the envelope which contained the check. The accused pleaded guilty to an attempt at grand larceny, and as there were mitigating circumstances he was sent to the Penitentiary for six months.

Henry Johnson, charged with stealing two boxes containing ribbons and straw goods, valued at $71, on the 2d of May, the property of Vandervеer, Jones & Co., pleaded guilty to petty larceny.

A similar plea was taken from Margaret Murphy, who on the 6th inst. stole a cloak worth $70 from Sarah Rosenthal, that being her first offence.

Johnson and Murphy were each sent to the Penitentiary for three months.

Frederick Frick and Thomas Hammond pleaded guilty to an attempt at grand larceny, the allegation being that on the 11th of this month they stole a silver watch, valued at $30, from Joseph K. Hudson, in whose company they were. Penitentiary one year was the sentence.

Mary Barrington was placed at the bar, charged with stealing $71 worth of clothing on the 18th of May, the property of William H. Browne. She pleaded guilty to petty larceny and was sent to the Penitentiary for six months.

A Desperate Conflict Between an Officer and a Citizen—A "Righteous" Verdict.

The only case disposed of by the jury was a charge of felonious assault and battery preferred by Officer

CONTINUED ON NINTH PAGE.